



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,579	01/08/2001	John L. Reid	INTL-0463-US (P9817)	5624
21906 7590 01/26/2007 TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631			EXAMINER BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER	
			ART UNIT 2195	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/756,579

Applicant(s)

REID, JOHN L.

Examiner

Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The affidavit filed on November 6, 2006 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the cited reference.
2. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the cited reference.
3. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the cited reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897).
4. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the cited reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice.
5. Applicant submitted no evidence of the conception, reduction to practice, or the diligence in filing that must be sent with the affidavit, i.e. a copy of disclosure submitted in July of 2000, any communication with the Applicant in preparing the application, a copy of the draft, etc. Therefore, the affidavit is insufficient.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Application Isolation in the Java Virtual Machine" by CZAJKOWSKI in view of "Multiprocessing and Portability for PDAs" by CZAJKOWSKI herein CZAJKOWSKI (2).

As to claim 1, CZAJKOWSKI teaches a method comprising: running at least two applications (applications); enabling the applications to share a class (class having static variables); enabling each application to define an address space specific to each application (via each application having a copy of the static fields for the class); and duplicating member data (static fields of the class) for the class for each application (application) in an address space (table shared between the applications that contains the copies of Counter\$sFields) (pg. 356, "Consider a class X, containing static fields...X\$aMethods maintains an instance of X\$sFields for each application; the methods of X\$aMethods access the correct instance of X\$sFields based on the application id extracted from the current thread... The second generated class is Counter\$aMethods. It contains a table mapping application identifiers onto per-application copies of Counter\$sFields... Each of them looks up the copy of Counter\$sFields corresponding to the current application and then accesses the named

Art Unit: 2195

field. If the lookup does not succeed it means that this application's copy of Counter's Fields has not been generated yet and that the appropriate initialization has to be taken care of."; pg 363, "The runtime modifications operate as follows. At load time, each class is examined and each static field is replicated n times (n is the maximum allowed number of applications... Fetching an application id and using it to index an array of copies of a static field translates into less than ten machine instructions... When an application gets loaded into the modified KVM, it is assigned an application id or is rejected if no more application slots are available at the moment. Whenever a class is used by this application for the first time, the static initializer is run (when present), initializing the correct replicas of static fields."). However, CZAJKOWSKI does not teach the application defines the address space in a shared memory wherein the duplicated member data is in the address space of the application of shared memory.

CZAJKOWSKI (2) teaches applications (applications) sharing (reusing) classes (classes) wherein each application creates an address space in shared memory for storing data related to a shared class (via the shared heap being logically partitioned into a set of separate sub-heaps wherein applications have access to a particular sub-heap for its data while sharing classes) (see figure 1 and section 3.1 on pages 3-4). It would be obvious that the static fields of CZAJKOWSKI would be the data that is stored in a particular applications portion of shared memory. Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of CZAJKOWSKI with the teachings of CZAJKOWSKI (2) in order to allow applications to reuse classes within a shared heap (pg. 3).

As to claim 2, CZAJKOWSKI teaches enabling each application to use a shared memory (via a table shared by the applications to access the correct Counter\$sField copy) (pg. 356, "Consider a class X, containing static fields...X\$aMethods maintains an instance of X\$sFields for each application; the methods of X\$aMethods access the correct instance of X\$sFields based on the application id extracted from the current thread...The second generated class is Counter\$aMethods. It contains a table mapping application identifiers onto per-application copies of Counter\$sFields...Each of them looks up the copy of Counter\$sFields corresponding to the current application and then accesses the named field. If the lookup does not succeed it means that this application's copy of Counter\$sFields has not been generated yet and that the appropriate initialization has to be taken care of."; pg 363, "The runtime modifications operate as follows. At load time, each class is examined and each static field is replicated n times (n is the maximum allowed number of applications...Fetching an application id and using it to index an array of copies of a static field translates into less than ten machine instructions...When an application gets loaded into the modified KVM, it is assigned an application id or is rejected if no more application slots are available at the moment. Whenever a class is used by this application for the first time, the static initializer is run (when present), initializing the correct replicas of static fields.").

As to claim 4, CZAJKOWSKI teaches duplicating (copy) process specific data (static fields) for each application (application) (pg. 356, "Consider a class X, containing

Art Unit: 2195

static fields...X\$aMethods maintains an instance of X\$sFields for each application; the methods of X\$aMethods access the correct instance of X\$sFields based on the application id extracted from the current thread...The second generated class is Counter\$aMethods. It contains a table mapping application identifiers onto per-application copies of Counter\$sFields...Each of them looks up the copy of Counter\$sFields corresponding to the current application and then accesses the named field. If the lookup does not succeed it means that this application's copy of Counter\$sFields has not been generated yet and that the appropriate initialization has to be taken care of.”; pg 363, “The runtime modifications operate as follows. At load time, each class is examined and each static field is replicated n times (n is the maximum allowed number of applications...Fetching an application id and using it to index an array of copies of a static field translates into less than ten machine instructions...When an application gets loaded into the modified KVM, it is assigned an application id or is rejected if no more application slots are available at the moment. Whenever a class is used by this application for the first time, the static initializer is run (when present), initializing the correct replicas of static fields.”).

As to claim 5, CZAJKOWSKI teaches automatically (during run-time) duplicating (copy) process specific data (static fields) in address space specific to each application ((pg. 356, “Consider a class X, containing static fields...X\$aMethods maintains an instance of X\$sFields for each application; the methods of X\$aMethods access the correct instance of X\$sFields based on the application id extracted from the current

Art Unit: 2195

thread...The second generated class is Counter\$aMethods. It contains a table mapping application identifiers onto per-application copies of Counter\$sFields...Each of them looks up the copy of Counter\$sFields corresponding to the current application and then accesses the named field. If the lookup does not succeed it means that this application's copy of Counter\$sFields has not been generated yet and that the appropriate initialization has to be taken care of."; pg 363, "The runtime modifications operate as follows. At load time, each class is examined and each static field is replicated n times (n is the maximum allowed number of applications...Fetching an application id and using it to index an array of copies of a static field translates into less than ten machine instructions...When an application gets loaded into the modified KVM, it is assigned an application id or is rejected if no more application slots are available at the moment. Whenever a class is used by this application for the first time, the static initializer is run (when present), initializing the correct replicas of static fields.").

As to claim 6, CZAJKOWSKI teaches defining a shared class (Counter\$aMethods) and using the share class to execute an instance of a class (Counter\$sFields) to share (pg. 356, "Consider a class X, containing static fields...X\$aMethods maintains an instance of X\$sFields for each application; the methods of X\$aMethods access the correct instance of X\$sFields based on the application id extracted from the current thread...The second generated class is Counter\$aMethods. It contains a table mapping application identifiers onto per-application copies of Counter\$sFields...Each of them looks up the copy of

Art Unit: 2195

Counter\$sFields corresponding to the current application and then accesses the named field. If the lookup does not succeed it means that this application's copy of Counter\$sFields has not been generated yet and that the appropriate initialization has to be taken care of."; pg 363, "The runtime modifications operate as follows. At load time, each class is examined and each static field is replicated n times (n is the maximum allowed number of applications... Fetching an application id and using it to index an array of copies of a static field translates into less than ten machine instructions... When an application gets loaded into the modified KVM, it is assigned an application id or is rejected if no more application slots are available at the moment. Whenever a class is used by this application for the first time, the static initializer is run (when present), initializing the correct replicas of static fields.").

As to claim 7, CZAJKOWSKI teaches invoking a shareable interface (initializer function / Counter\$aMethods functions) to obtain a handle (application id) (pg. 356, "The original class Counter, undergoes the following modifications. All static fields are removed from Counter. A new method, hidden\$initializer(), is added. It contains a modified code of the static initializer of Counter. It is invoked whenever a new application uses static fields of Counter for the first time."; pg. 356, "In our particular case there is only one static field and thus Counter\$aMethods has two such access methods: put\$cnt() and get\$cnt(). Each of them looks up the copy of Counter\$sFields corresponding to the current application and then accesses the named field. If the lookup does not succeed it means that this application's copy of Counter\$sFields has

Art Unit: 2195

not been generated yet and that the appropriate initialization has to be taken care of.”; see also Figure 2, program code wherein `int id = Thread.currentThread().getId()`, wherein the identifier is retrieved from the application thread).

As to claim 8, CZAJKOWSKI teaches specifying the handle (application id) on each method call to resolve the context (static fields) of the handle (application id) (wherein the application id is used to retrieve the correct static fields for the shared class) (pg. 356, “Consider a class X, containing static fields...X\$aMethods maintains an instance of X\$sFields for each application; the methods of X\$aMethods access the correct instance of X\$sFields based on the application id extracted from the current thread...The second generated class is Counter\$aMethods. It contains a table mapping application identifiers onto per-application copies of Counter\$sFields...Each of them looks up the copy of Counter\$sFields corresponding to the current application and then accesses the named field. If the lookup does not succeed it means that this application’s copy of Counter\$sFields has not been generated yet and that the appropriate initialization has to be taken care of.”; pg 363, “The runtime modifications operate as follows. At load time, each class is examined and each static field is replicated n times (n is the maximum allowed number of applications...Fetching an application id and using it to index an array of copies of a static field translates into less than ten machine instructions...When an application gets loaded into the modified KVM, it is assigned an application id or is rejected if no more application slots are available at

Art Unit: 2195

the moment. Whenever a class is used by this application for the first time, the static initializer is run (when present), initializing the correct replicas of static fields.”).

As to claims 9, 10 and 12-16, reference is made to an article comprising a medium that corresponds to the method of claims 1, 2 and 4-8 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4-8 above. Claim 9 further details a processor-based system. CZAJKOWSKI teaches that the teachings are used on a PALM device that has a power of 2.7 MIPS at 16.6MHz processor clock and a heap (pg. 362). Therefore, it would be obvious that the teachings are executed on a processor-based system (PALM device).

As to claims 17, 18 and 20, reference is made to a system that corresponds to the method of claims 1, 2 and 4 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 above. Claim 17 further details the system having a processor and storage. CZAJKOWSKI teaches that the teachings are used on a PALM device that has a power of 2.7 MIPS at 16.6MHz processor clock and a heap (pg. 362). Therefore, it would be obvious that the teachings are executed on a processor-based system (PALM device).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3759. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2195

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 17, 2007


LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER